



**U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services**

**Non-Precedent Decision of the  
Administrative Appeals Office**

In Re: 10087283

Date: MAR. 12, 2021

**Appeal of Texas Service Center Decision**

Form I-140, Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker (Advanced Degree, Exceptional Ability, National Interest Waiver)

The Petitioner, a petroleum engineer, seeks second preference immigrant classification as a member of the professions holding an advanced degree, as well as a national interest waiver of the job offer requirement attached to this EB-2 classification. *See* Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act) section 203(b)(2), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(2).

The Director of the Texas Service Center denied the petition, concluding that the Petitioner qualified for classification as a member of the professions holding an advanced degree, but had not established that a waiver of the required job offer, and thus of the labor certification, would be in the national interest.

On appeal, the Petitioner submits a brief asserting eligibility for a national interest waiver.

In these proceedings, it is the petitioner's burden to establish eligibility for the immigration benefit sought. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361; *Matter of Chawathe*, 25 I&N Dec. 369, 375 (AAO 2010). Upon *de novo* review, we will dismiss the appeal.

**I. LAW**

To establish eligibility for a national interest waiver, a petitioner must first demonstrate qualification for the underlying EB-2 visa classification, as either an advanced degree professional or an individual of exceptional ability in the sciences, arts, or business. Because this classification requires that the individual's services be sought by a U.S. employer, a separate showing is required to establish that a waiver of the job offer requirement is in the national interest.

Section 203(b) of the Act sets out this sequential framework:

- (2) Aliens who are members of the professions holding advanced degrees or aliens of exceptional ability. –

(A) In general. – Visas shall be made available . . . to qualified immigrants who are members of the professions holding advanced degrees or their equivalent or who because of their exceptional ability in the sciences, arts, or business, will substantially benefit prospectively the national economy, cultural or educational interests, or welfare of the United States, and whose services in the sciences, arts, professions, or business are sought by an employer in the United States.

(B) Waiver of job offer –

(i) National interest waiver. . . . [T]he Attorney General may, when the Attorney General deems it to be in the national interest, waive the requirements of subparagraph (A) that an alien's services in the sciences, arts, professions, or business be sought by an employer in the United States.

While neither the statute nor the pertinent regulations define the term “national interest,” we set forth a framework for adjudicating national interest waiver petitions in the precedent decision *Matter of Dhanasar*, 26 I&N Dec. 884 (AAO 2016).<sup>1</sup> *Dhanasar* states that after a petitioner has established eligibility for EB-2 classification, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) may, as matter of discretion<sup>2</sup>, grant a national interest waiver if the petitioner demonstrates: (1) that the foreign national’s proposed endeavor has both substantial merit and national importance; (2) that the foreign national is well positioned to advance the proposed endeavor; and (3) that, on balance, it would be beneficial to the United States to waive the requirements of a job offer and thus of a labor certification.

The first prong, substantial merit and national importance, focuses on the specific endeavor that the foreign national proposes to undertake. The endeavor’s merit may be demonstrated in a range of areas such as business, entrepreneurialism, science, technology, culture, health, or education. In determining whether the proposed endeavor has national importance, we consider its potential prospective impact.

The second prong shifts the focus from the proposed endeavor to the foreign national. To determine whether he or she is well positioned to advance the proposed endeavor, we consider factors including, but not limited to: the individual’s education, skills, knowledge and record of success in related or similar efforts; a model or plan for future activities; any progress towards achieving the proposed endeavor; and the interest of potential customers, users, investors, or other relevant entities or individuals.

The third prong requires the petitioner to demonstrate that, on balance, it would be beneficial to the United States to waive the requirements of a job offer and thus of a labor certification. In performing this analysis, USCIS may evaluate factors such as: whether, in light of the nature of the foreign national’s qualifications or the proposed endeavor, it would be impractical either for the foreign national to secure a job offer or for the petitioner to obtain a labor certification; whether, even assuming

---

<sup>1</sup> In announcing this new framework, we vacated our prior precedent decision, *Matter of New York State Department of Transportation*, 22 I&N Dec. 215 (Act. Assoc. Comm’r 1998) (NYSDOT).

<sup>2</sup> See also *Poursina v. USCIS*, No. 17-16579, 2019 WL 4051593 (Aug. 28, 2019) (finding USCIS’ decision to grant or deny a national interest waiver to be discretionary in nature).

that other qualified U.S. workers are available, the United States would still benefit from the foreign national's contributions; and whether the national interest in the foreign national's contributions is sufficiently urgent to warrant forgoing the labor certification process. In each case, the factor(s) considered must, taken together, indicate that on balance, it would be beneficial to the United States to waive the requirements of a job offer and thus of a labor certification.<sup>3</sup>

## II. ANALYSIS

The Director concluded that the Petitioner qualifies as a member of the professions holding an advanced degree. The Director also determined that the Petitioner had established that the proposed endeavor met the substantial merit portion of the first prong set forth in the *Dhanasar* analytical framework. The Director's decision then discussed the deficiencies in the submitted evidence and provided a well-reasoned explanation as to why the Petitioner did not meet the national importance portion of the first prong.

Therefore, upon consideration of the entire record, including the arguments made on appeal, we adopt and affirm the Director's decision with the comments below.<sup>4</sup> See *Matter of P. Singh, Attorney*, 26 I&N Dec. 623 (BIA 2015) (citing *Matter of Burbano*, 20 I&N Dec. 872, 874 (BIA 1994); see also *Chen v. INS*, 87 F.3d 5, 7-8 (1st Cir. 1996) ("[I]f a reviewing tribunal decides that the facts and evaluative judgments prescinding from them have been adequately confronted and correctly resolved by a trial judge or hearing officer, then the tribunal is free simply to adopt those findings" provided the tribunal's order reflects individualized attention to the case)).

In determining national importance, the relevant question is not the importance of the industry or profession in which the individual will work; instead we focus on the "the specific endeavor that the foreign national proposes to undertake." See *Dhanasar*, 26 I&N Dec. at 889. We further indicated that "we look for broader implications" of the proposed endeavor and that "[a]n undertaking may have national importance for example, because it has national or even global implications within a particular field." *Id.* We also stated that "[a]n endeavor that has significant potential to employ U.S. workers or has other substantial positive economic effects, particularly in an economically depressed area, for instance, may well be understood to have national importance." *Id.* at 890.

In this matter, the Petitioner's proposed endeavor "is to continue his career in the United States as a Petroleum Engineer in the oil and gas sector of the [e]nergy sector." On appeal, rather than providing additional evidence to overcome the Director's conclusions, the Petitioner again discusses his education and experience, including specific projects he has worked on and awards from his employer. He also refers to a letter of recommendation praising the Petitioner's expertise and his prior research and presentations "in which he proposed improvements in oil well

areas." Although the Petitioner claims that "[b]usiness internal process/systems mainly get disseminated throughout the industry . . . through business events, symposia, conferences, word of mouth, . . . etc." and that all of these methods "contribute to a particular innovation getting spread and adopted by important players in the field," the record does not include sufficient documentation to establish what impact, if any, his proposed improvements have had on the field, whether they have

<sup>3</sup> See *Dhanasar*, 26 I&N Dec. at 888-91, for elaboration on these three prongs.

<sup>4</sup> While we may not discuss every document submitted, we have reviewed and considered each one.

been adopted by others,<sup>5</sup> or what specific original innovations he has been responsible for that have been implemented by other companies. Further, the Petitioner’s engineering expertise and record of success in previous projects are considerations under *Dhanasar*’s second prong, which “shifts the focus from the proposed endeavor to the foreign national.” *Id.* at 890. The issue here is whether the Petitioner has demonstrated the national importance of his proposed work.

The Petitioner’s statements reflect his intention to provide valuable services and expertise for his employer, along with general assertions such as “his work functions will produce substantially positive economic opportunities for the nation, due to the ripple effects of his professional activities,” “his proposed endeavor will result in the production of oil and gas that will be distributed and purchased throughout the United States and abroad,” and his “proposed work maximizes business revenue, and ultimately increases the flow of money in the U.S. on a national level – consequently contributing to U.S. gross domestic product.” He also claims that his “proposed endeavor is unquestionably of national importance, given the significant economic impact of the energy industry in the United States, as well as globally” and that the “recent boom in oil and natural gas production has thus brought the U.S. clear economic benefits.” To evaluate whether the Petitioner’s proposed endeavor satisfies the national importance requirement, however, we look to evidence documenting the “potential prospective impact” of his work, not the importance or economic benefits of his industry. The Petitioner does not offer sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the prospective impact of his proposed endeavor rises to the level of national importance.

Furthermore, the Petitioner has not demonstrated that the specific endeavor he proposes to undertake, as opposed to the energy sector as a whole, has significant potential to employ U.S. workers or otherwise offers substantial positive economic effects for our nation. Without evidence regarding any projected U.S. economic impact or job creation directly attributable to his future work, the record does not show that benefits to the regional or national economy resulting from the Petitioner’s projects would reach the level of “substantial positive economic effects” contemplated by *Dhanasar*. *Id.* at 890.

In *Dhanasar*, we determined that the petitioner’s teaching activities did not rise to the level of having national importance because they would not impact his field more broadly. *Id.* at 893. Here, we find the record does not show that the Petitioner’s proposed endeavor stands to sufficiently extend beyond his employer(s) and their projects to impact the industry more broadly at a level commensurate with national importance. Nor has he shown that the particular work he proposes to undertake offers original innovations that contribute to advancements in the oil and gas industry, rather than just affecting projects involving his company, or otherwise has broader implications for his field. For all these reasons, the Petitioner’s proposed work does not meet the first prong of the *Dhanasar* framework.

Because the documentation in the record does not establish the national importance of his proposed endeavor as required by the first prong of the *Dhanasar* precedent decision, the Petitioner has not demonstrated eligibility for a national interest waiver. Since this issue is dispositive of the Petitioner’s appeal, we decline to reach and hereby reserve the appellate arguments regarding the remaining issues. See *INS v. Bagamasbad*, 429 U.S. 24, 25 (1976) (“courts and agencies are not required to make

---

<sup>5</sup> Although the Petitioner claims one citation, the Petitioner did not provide a copy of the citing article and we were only able to obtain the abstract at the provided Internet address. We are, therefore, unable to determine the significance of the citation.

findings on issues the decision of which is unnecessary to the results they reach”); *see also Matter of L-A-C-*, 26 I&N Dec. 516, 526 n.7 (BIA 2015) (declining to reach alternative issues on appeal where an applicant is otherwise ineligible).

### III. CONCLUSION

As the Petitioner has not met the requisite first prong of the *Dhanasar* analytical framework, we conclude he has not established that he is eligible for, or otherwise merits, a national interest waiver as a matter of discretion. The appeal will be dismissed for the above stated reasons, with each considered as an independent and alternate basis for the decision.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.